

REMARKS

Claims 1-64, all the claims pending in the application, stand rejected. Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 11, 12, 15, 18, 20, 37, 41, 43, 44, 46 and 50-52 are amended. Claims 2, 4, 19, 35, 36 and 45 are cancelled. New claim 65 is added.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 2 and 4, Claim 18 is amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 19, 35, 36 and additional limitations disclosed in the original specification. New claim 65 is based on the limitations of claims 18, 19, 35, 45 and additional limitations disclosed in the original specification.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-64 objected to because "cadenza" should read "credenza," as best interpreted by the Examiner. This correction has been made.

Claim 1 is objected to because of quotation marks around "private," which the Examiner asserts should be deleted. Appropriate correction has been made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 4-5, 11-15, 18, 35-36, 43, 45, and 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cantu (6,056,239). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1

Independent claim 1 now has the limitations of claim 2, which is not rejected as anticipated by Cantu. Thus, the rejection is overcome.

Claims 4, 5 and 11-15

As to claim 4, the rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of the claim. As to claims 5 and 11-15, the rejection is overcome for the reasons given for parent claim 1.

Claim 18

Independent claim 18 now has the limitations of claim 19, which is not rejected as anticipated by Cantu. Thus, the rejection is overcome. Moreover, claim 18 has been amended to recite that "the furniture can be selectively arranged in a number of different configurations

adapted for relaxation, work, and sleep, with the bed being movable between a storage portion and a sleep portion, with the bed being positioned in the storage position when the furniture is arranged in the relaxation and work configurations and in the sleep position when the furniture is arranged in the sleep configuration.” These added features are not taught in Cantu.

Claims 43, 45 and 50-51

As to claim 45, the rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of the claim. As to claims 43, 50 and 51, the rejection is overcome for the reasons given for parent claim 18.

Claims 1-3, 18-20, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US-6152400 (Sankrithi et al.).

Claim 1

Independent claim 1 now has the limitations of claim 4, which is not rejected as anticipated by Sankrithi et al. Thus, the rejection is overcome.

Claims 2 and 3

As to claim 2, the rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of the claim. As to claim 3, the rejection is overcome for the reasons given for parent claim 1.

Claim 18

Independent claim 18 now has the limitations of claim 36, which is not rejected as anticipated by Sankrithi et al. Thus, the rejection is overcome. Moreover, claim 18 has been amended to recite that “the furniture can be selectively arranged in a number of different configurations adapted for relaxation, work, and sleep, with the bed being movable between a storage portion and a sleep portion, with the bed being positioned in the storage position when the furniture is arranged in the relaxation and work configurations and in the sleep position when the furniture is arranged in the sleep configuration.” These added features are not taught in Sankrithi et al.

Claims 19, 20 and 35

As to claims 19 and 35, the rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of these claims. As to claims 20, the rejection is overcome for the reasons given for parent claim 18.

Claims 1, 18, 21-23, 27-28, 32, and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Riedinger et al (5,024,398). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1

Independent claim 1 now has the limitations of claims 2 and 4, which are not rejected as anticipated by Riedinger et al. Thus, the rejection is overcome.

Claim 18

Independent claim 18 now has the limitations of claims 19, 35 and 36, which are not rejected as anticipated by Riedinger et al. Thus, the rejection is overcome. Moreover, claim 18 has been amended to recite that “the furniture can be selectively arranged in a number of different configurations adapted for relaxation, work, and sleep, with the bed being movable between a storage portion and a sleep portion, with the bed being positioned in the storage position when the furniture is arranged in the relaxation and work configurations and in the sleep position when the furniture is arranged in the sleep configuration.” These added features are not taught in Riedinger et al.

Claims 21-23, 27-28, 32, and 45-46

As to claim 45, the rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of the claim. As to claims 21-23, 27, 28, 32, and 46, the rejection is overcome for the reasons given for parent claim 18.

Claims 1, 4-5, 8-13, 18, 35-36, 43-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by GB-2362095 (Dryburgh). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1

Independent claim 1 now has the limitations of claim 2, which is not rejected as anticipated by Dryburgh. Thus, the rejection is overcome.

Claims 4, 5 and 8-13

As to claim 4, the rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of the claim. As to claims 5 and 11-13, the rejection is overcome for the reasons given for parent claim 1.

Claim 18

Independent claim 18 now has the limitations of claim 19, which is not rejected as anticipated by Dryburgh. Thus, the rejection is overcome. Moreover, claim 18 has been amended to recite that “the furniture can be selectively arranged in a number of different configurations adapted for relaxation, work, and sleep, with the bed being movable between a storage portion and a sleep portion, with the bed being positioned in the storage position when the furniture is arranged in the relaxation and work configurations and in the sleep position when the furniture is arranged in the sleep configuration.” These added features are not taught in Dryburgh.

Claims 35-36, 43-59

As to claims 35, 36 and 45, the rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of the claim. As to claims 43, 44 and 46-59, the rejection is overcome for the reasons given for parent claim 18.

Claims 18, and 36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Crawford (2,612,120). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 18

Independent claim 18 now has the limitations of claims 19 and 35, which are not rejected as anticipated by Crawford. Thus, the rejection is overcome. Moreover, claim 18 has been amended to recite that “the furniture can be selectively arranged in a number of different configurations adapted for relaxation, work, and sleep, with the bed being movable between a storage portion and a sleep portion, with the bed being positioned in the storage position when the furniture is arranged in the relaxation and work configurations and in the sleep position when the furniture is arranged in the sleep configuration.” These added features are not taught in Crawford.

Claims 36-41

As to claims 36, the rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of the claim. As to claims 37-41, the rejection is overcome for the reasons given for parent claim 18.

Claims 18, 21-23, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rodgers (245,746). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 18

Independent claim 18 now has the limitations of claims 19, 35 and 36, which are not rejected as anticipated by Rodgers. Thus, the rejection is overcome. Moreover, claim 18 has been amended to recite that “the furniture can be selectively arranged in a number of different configurations adapted for relaxation, work, and sleep, with the bed being movable between a storage portion and a sleep portion, with the bed being positioned in the storage position when the furniture is arranged in the relaxation and work configurations and in the sleep position when the furniture is arranged in the sleep configuration.” These added features are not taught in Rodgers.

Claims 21-23 and 27-29

As to these claims, the rejection is overcome for the reasons given for parent claim 18.

Claims 18 and 36-37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sprenger (6,273,366). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 18

Independent claim 18 now has the limitations of claims 19 and 35, which are not rejected as anticipated by Sprenger. Thus, the rejection is overcome. Moreover, claim 18 has been amended to recite that “the furniture can be selectively arranged in a number of different configurations adapted for relaxation, work, and sleep, with the bed being movable between a storage portion and a sleep portion, with the bed being positioned in the storage position when the furniture is arranged in the relaxation and work configurations and in the sleep position when the furniture is arranged in the sleep configuration.” These added features are not taught in Sprenger.

Claims 36 and 37

As to claims 36, the rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of the claim. As to claim 3, the rejection is overcome for the reasons given for parent claim 18.

Claims 1 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Saint-Jalmes (FR 2842497 as evidenced by corresponding application US-2005/0001097). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1

Independent claim 1 now has the limitations of claims 2 and 4, which are not rejected as anticipated by Saint-Jalmes. Thus, the rejection is overcome.

Claim 17

As to claim 17, the rejection is overcome for the reasons given for parent claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riedinger. This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

As to claim 4, the rejection is moot.

Claims 5-8 would be patentable for the reasons given for parent claim 1, which expressly recites that the compartment walls are at least 1.5m high. The selection of this height, given the additional limitations of the claim, would not be obvious.

Claims 4 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saint-Jalmes in view of Sankrithi. This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

As to claim 4, the rejection is moot.

Claims 15 would be patentable for the reasons given for parent claim 1, which expressly recites that the compartment walls are at least 1.5m high. The selection of this height, given the additional limitations of the claim, would not be obvious.

Claim 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SaintJalmes in view of Sankrithi as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Smith (4,314,733). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 16 would be patentable for the reasons given for parent claim 1, which expressly recites that the compartment walls are at least 1.5m high. The selection of this height, given the additional limitations of the claim, would not be obvious.

Claims 24, 25 and 30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodgers in view of Oakley (2003/0089269). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claims 24, 25 and 30 would be patentable for the reasons given for parent claim 18, which has the limitations of claims 19, 35 and 36. Moreover, claim 18 has been amended to recite that “the furniture can be selectively arranged in a number of different configurations adapted for relaxation, work, and sleep, with the bed being movable between a storage portion and a sleep portion, with the bed being positioned in the storage position when the furniture is arranged in the relaxation and work configurations and in the sleep position when the furniture is arranged in the sleep configuration.” These added features are not taught in Rodgers or Oakley. Oakley is merely cited for its teaching of sliding doors with windows.

Claims 26 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodgers in view of Oakley as applied to claims 25 and 30 above, and further in view of Schlect (2001/0022218) and Andersson (6,092,581). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claims 26 and 31 would be patentable for the reasons given for parent claim 18, which has the limitations of claims 19, 35 and 36. Moreover, claim 18 has been amended to recite that “the furniture can be selectively arranged in a number of different configurations adapted for relaxation, work, and sleep, with the bed being movable between a storage portion and a sleep portion, with the bed being positioned in the storage position when the furniture is arranged in the relaxation and work configurations and in the sleep position when the furniture is arranged in the sleep configuration.” These added features are not taught in Schlecht or Andersson. Schlecht is merely cited for its teaching of a window roll-up blind for a vehicle, where the blinds are “virtually completely withdrawn behind the contours of the window” (page 1, paragraph 9) and would not interfere with the sliding motion of the doors in Rodgers. Andersson is merely cited for teaching the purpose of “protection from view.”

Claims 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riedinger in view of Kimmet (2002/0084042). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claims 33 and 34 would be patentable for the reasons given for parent claim 18, which has the limitations of claims 19, 35 and 36. Moreover, claim 18 has been amended to recite that “the furniture can be selectively arranged in a number of different configurations adapted for relaxation, work, and sleep, with the bed being movable between a storage portion and a sleep portion, with the bed being positioned in the storage position when the furniture is arranged in the relaxation and work configurations and in the sleep position when the furniture is arranged in the sleep configuration.” These added features are not taught in Riedinger in view of Kimmet. Kimmet is merely cited for its teaching of a curtain for use in closing a door to a cubicle.

Claims 41-42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sprenger in view of Dryburgh and Reppas (4,318,195). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claims 41 and 42 would be patentable for the reasons given for parent claim 18, which has the limitations of claims 19, 35 and 36. Moreover, claim 18 has been amended to recite that “the furniture can be selectively arranged in a number of different configurations adapted for relaxation, work, and sleep, with the bed being movable between a storage portion and a sleep portion, with the bed being positioned in the storage position when the furniture is arranged in the relaxation and work configurations and in the sleep position when the furniture is arranged in the sleep configuration.” These added features are not taught in Reppas.

Reppas is only cited for its teaching of a bed that folds out from a wall (Reppas fig. 7 on top) like in Sprenger and is supported by a credenza (Reppas fig. 7 on top, item 78; col. 3, lines 46-62) when the bed is in the sleep position. Further, when the bed is raised to a stored position, the credenza is moved to a raised operative position in which the credenza can be accessed conveniently. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the folding bed support system of Reppas for the folding bed of Sprenger, for the purpose of raising the credenza to a standard or variable height as in Reppas col. 4, lines 64-68.

Claims 60-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dryburgh in view of Dettmers (6,520,091). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claims 60-64 would be patentable for the reasons given for parent claim 18, which has the limitations of claims 19, 35 and 36. Moreover, claim 18 has been amended to recite that “the furniture can be selectively arranged in a number of different configurations adapted for relaxation, work, and sleep, with the bed being movable between a storage portion and a sleep portion, with the bed being positioned in the storage position when the furniture is arranged in the relaxation and work configurations and in the sleep position when the furniture is arranged in the sleep configuration.” These added features are not taught in Dettmers.

Dettmers is only cited for its teaching of an automatic table assembly comprising:

A base member (18, above Dettmers figures) that can slide between the stored position adjacent the side wall and the operative position between the chair and the seat (transition from Dettmers fig. 3 to Dettmers fig. 2 involves member 18 sliding up track 22 from a stored position to an operative position; col. 2, lines 30-62),

A support arm (16, Dettmers fig. 2) pivotally mounted to the base member (see Dettmers figs. 2, 3) and foldable between the storage position and the operative position (see figs. 2, 3 for folded storage position and unfolded operative position),

And a table pivotally mounted to the support arm (14, Dettmers fig. 2; shown folded about a pivot point in fig. 3).

Also, the Examiner asserts that Dettmers shows an operative position in Dettmers Fig. 2 requires several motions, such that the table assembly is considered capable of movement from the stored position to the operative position.

Also, the Examiner asserts that the support arm (Dettmers 16) of Dettmers fig. 2 comprises a table support element and is considered in its position to support an underside of the table (Dettmers fig. 2, 16 supports underside of 14) when the table is in the horizontal position.

Further, the Examiner asserts that Dettmers provides a compartment wherein the table comprises side wings that can be folded between an inward storage position and an outward operative position and the two halves of Dettmers table 14 can be considered side wings, which are capable of folding between an inward storage position and an outward operative position.

Finally, the Examiner asserts that Dettmers provides the compartment wherein a base member defines a storage compartment.

However, the basic features of parent claim 18, coupled with the features in the dependent claims, is not taught in the cited references.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alan J. Kasper/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Alan J. Kasper
Registration No. 25,426

Date: July 25, 2008